

Exhibit 8

Redacted



Keker, Van Nest & Peters LLP
633 Battery Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
415 391 5400
keker.com

Matthias A. Kamber
(415) 773-6635
mkamber@keker.com

July 23, 2021

VIA EMAIL

Brian Seeve
PRINCE LOBEL TYE LLP
One International Place, Ste. 3700
Boston, MA 02110

Re: *Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC*; Case No. 1:19-cv-12551 FDS

Dear Brian:

I write in response to your letter of July 22, 2021. In that letter, sent on the eve of the fact discovery cutoff in this case, you demanded that Google make available on its source code computer three different sets of code. I will address each set in turn.

First, you requested specific code described by Jeff Dean during his deposition related to bfloat16. While it is not Google's role to assist Singular in its review of source code, from our review, the code produced appears to comport with Dr. Dean's testimony. Regardless, I can confirm that we have searched for and produced all code that could be located related to the inception and use of bfloat16 at Google in 2013.

Second, you demanded "code that defines the value of the variable

[REDACTED] Although you have repeatedly refused to explain the relevance of this code and Google disagrees that this could be relevant or is required to be produced, we are willing to produce it solely to avoid yet another unnecessary dispute. We will make the code available on the source code computer as soon as practicable. And to provide Singular with time to review the constant discussed above, Google is willing to maintain its source code computer and keep it accessible to Singular beyond today's fact discovery cutoff. Specifically, given the limited amount of additional code at issue, Google is willing to make the code available for a single day of review in either Boston or San Francisco through July 30—one week beyond the fact discovery cutoff.

Third, you demanded that Google produce *all* code "corresponding to the TensorCore in the TPU v2 and TPU v3 products." You have offered no justification for this broad demand, nor is there any: unlimited source code production is neither necessary nor warranted in patent litigation. Indeed, Singular also didn't produce the entire code case for its S1 chip. Instead, it has produced Verilog code for only certain modules in the ALU of an individual S1 APE. The inappropriateness of Singular's demand is further underscored by the fact that it comes the day

Brian Seeve

July 23, 2021

Page 2

before the close of fact discovery, despite the fact Google first made its code available in November of last year.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthias Kamber".

Matthias A. Kamber